

Gor'kov and Eliashberg Linear Response Theory: Rigorous Derivation and Limits of Applicability

Ya. M. Blanter^{a,b} and A. D. Mirlin^{a,c}

^a *Institut für Theorie der Kondensierten Materie, Universität Karlsruhe, 76128 Karlsruhe,
Germany*

^b *Department of Theoretical Physics, Moscow Institute for Steel and Alloys, Leninskii Pr. 4,
117936 Moscow, Russia*

^c *Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, 188350 Gatchina, St. Petersburg, Russia*

(September 15, 1995)

Abstract

A rigorous microscopic calculation of the polarizability of disordered mesoscopic particles within the grand canonical ensemble is given in terms of the supersymmetry method. The phenomenological result of Gor'kov and Eliashberg is confirmed. Thus the underlying assumptions of their method are justified. This encourages application of RMT in the Gor'kov–Eliashberg style to more complicated situations.

PACS numbers: 72.15.-v, 73.20.Dx, 77.22.-d

Nearly 30 years ago Gor'kov and Eliashberg (GE) in the pioneering paper [1] applied the random matrix theory (RMT) and the concept of level correlation to the condensed matter physics. They studied the polarizability of a small (mesoscopic) disordered metallic particle. The dipole moment of the particle in a weak electric field $\mathbf{E}(t)$ is given by the Kubo formula:

$$\langle d_i(t) \rangle = i \int_{-\infty}^t \langle \langle [d_i(t), d_j(t')] \rangle_T \rangle E_j(t') dt' \quad (1)$$

Here the square brackets stand for the commutator while the angular ones denote the impurity $\langle \dots \rangle$ and the thermodynamic $\langle \dots \rangle_T$ averages. Introducing a set of eigenstates $|k\rangle$ and eigenvalues ϵ_k of the Hamiltonian in a particular disorder configuration, one can rewrite Eq. (1) as

$$\langle d_i(\omega) \rangle = e^2 E_j(\omega) \left\langle \sum_{k,l} \frac{n_F(\epsilon_l) - n_F(\epsilon_k)}{\epsilon_k - \epsilon_l + \omega + i\delta} (r_i)_{kl} (r_j)_{lk} \right\rangle \quad (2)$$

Here $(r_i)_{kl}$ is the matrix element of the coordinate: $(r_i)_{kl} = \langle k | \hat{r}_i | l \rangle$, and $\hbar = 1$. The consequent analysis of Eq. (2) by GE is based on the following assumptions:

- (i) The product of the matrix elements in Eq.(2) can be averaged independently of the remaining part of the expression;
- (ii) This averaging can be performed quasiclassically;
- (iii) The remaining summation over the energy levels can be performed with the use of the two-level correlation function known from the random matrix theory [2].

This semi-phenomenological calculation inspired a number of attempts to improve it. First, Strässler, Rice, and Wyder [3] have pointed out that GE calculated in fact the response to the local electric field rather than to the external one. We will return to this point later. Then, Devaty and Sievers [4] corrected some minor mistakes contained in the GE paper. Shklovskii [5], and later Sivan and Imry [6] considered the modification of the GE result for the canonical ensemble. Efetov [7] derived the two-point level correlator for a disordered granule by means of the supersymmetry method and showed that it has exactly the same form as in RMT, thus having justified the assumption (iii) of GE. Finally, Frahm, Mühlischlegel, and Németh [8] attacked the assumption (ii) and tried to improve the GE result by introduction of frequency-dependent averaged matrix elements. However, for small frequencies $\omega \ll E_c$ with $E_c = D/L^2$ being the Thouless energy (here D and L are the diffusion coefficient and the size of the system respectively) this dependence proved to be inessential and they have just reproduced the GE result for the matrix elements.

Below we revisit this problem completely. We restrict ourselves to the case of diffusive mesoscopic system ($l \ll L$, with l being the mean free path) and grand canonical ensemble. For simplicity we consider only the case of Gaussian Unitary Ensemble (GUE). We present a *microscopic, well-controlled* calculation, based on the supersymmetry method, that does not involve GE assumptions (i), (ii), and (iii). We demonstrate that the GE result is correct (to some extent, which we also analyze), and hence the assumptions (i) and (ii) are justified. Consequently we are able to calculate responses of rather general form, and we discuss the conditions of applicability of the GE method.

For our purpose the formula (1) may be conveniently rewritten in terms of the Matsubara Green's functions. In the Fourier representation we have $d_i(\omega) = \alpha_{ij}(\omega)E_j(\omega)$, $\alpha_{ij} = \alpha\delta_{ij}$, and the polarizability $\alpha(\omega)$ is:

$$\alpha(i\omega_n) = -\frac{e^2}{3}T \sum_{\epsilon_m} \int \mathbf{r}_1 \mathbf{r}_2 d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 \langle G(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, i\epsilon_m + i\omega_n) G(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1, i\epsilon_m) \rangle \quad (3)$$

The integrand contains a combination $\mathbf{r}_1 \mathbf{r}_2$, which is not translationally invariant. This can be cured with the use of the identity

$$T \sum_{\epsilon_m} \int d\mathbf{r}_1 \langle G(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \epsilon_m + \omega_n) G(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1, \epsilon_m) \rangle = 0, \quad (4)$$

which enables us to replace this combination by a translationally invariant one $-(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2)^2/2$. After the analytical continuation $i\omega_n \rightarrow \omega$ is performed, Eq. (3) is expressed through the advanced and retarded Green's functions as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(\omega) = & \frac{ie^2}{12\pi} \int d\epsilon d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 (\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2)^2 \left\{ n_F(\epsilon) \langle G^R(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \epsilon + \omega) G^R(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1, \epsilon) \rangle - \right. \\ & - n_F(\epsilon + \omega) \langle G^A(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \epsilon + \omega) G^A(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1, \epsilon) \rangle + \\ & \left. + [n_F(\epsilon + \omega) - n_F(\epsilon)] \langle G^R(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \epsilon + \omega) G^A(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1, \epsilon) \rangle \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The products $\langle G^R G^R \rangle$ and $\langle G^A G^A \rangle$ can be calculated in the usual impurity perturbation theory (see, e.g. [9]). Direct calculation gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \int d\epsilon \left\{ n_F(\epsilon) \langle G^R(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \epsilon + \omega) G^R(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1, \epsilon) \rangle - n_F(\epsilon + \omega) \langle G^A(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \epsilon + \omega) G^A(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1, \epsilon) \rangle \right\} \approx \\ \approx \frac{i\nu}{4r^4} \exp\left(-\frac{r}{l}\right) [\sin 2p_F r - 2p_F r \cos 2p_F r] + \omega \left(\frac{\pi\nu}{p_F r}\right)^2 \exp\left(-\frac{r}{l}\right) \cos(2p_F r) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Here $r = |\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|$, and ν is the density of states.

At the same time the perturbation theory is not valid for the $\langle G^R G^A \rangle$ term, and we involve the supersymmetry technique [7,10] to calculate it. After the standard manipulations we get

$$\langle G^R G^A \rangle(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \epsilon, \omega) = - \int DQ \left\{ g_{bb}^{11}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) g_{bb}^{22}(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1) + g_{bb}^{12}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_1) g_{bb}^{21}(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_2) \right\} e^{-F[Q]} \quad (7)$$

Here $F[Q]$ is the action of the supermatrix sigma model:

$$F[Q] = \frac{\pi\nu}{4} \int d\mathbf{r} \text{Str}[D(\nabla Q)^2 + 2i(\omega + i\delta)\Lambda Q], \quad (8)$$

$Q = T^{-1}\Lambda T$ is a 4×4 supermatrix, $\Lambda = \text{diag}(1, 1, -1, -1)$, and T belongs to the supercoset space $U(1, 1|2)$. The symbol Str denotes the supertrace defined as $\text{Str}A = A_{bb}^{11} - A_{ff}^{11} + A_{bb}^{22} - A_{ff}^{22}$. The upper matrix indices correspond to the retarded-advanced decomposition, while the lower indices denote the boson-fermion one. The Green's function g in Eq. (7) is the solution to the matrix equation:

$$\left[-i\left(\epsilon + \frac{\omega}{2} - \hat{H}_0\right) - \frac{i}{2}(\omega + i\delta)\Lambda + Q/2\tau\right] g(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \delta(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2) \quad (9)$$

We consider now two terms in Eq. (7) separately. The first one yields (cf. [11]):

$$\begin{aligned} & -\langle g_{bb}^{11}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) g_{bb}^{22}(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1) \rangle_F \approx \\ & \approx \begin{cases} [\text{Re } G^R(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)]^2 - [\text{Im } G^R(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)]^2 \langle Q_{bb}^{11}(\mathbf{r}_1) Q_{bb}^{22}(\mathbf{r}_1) \rangle_F, & r \ll l \\ 0, & r \gg l \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Here G^R is the impurity-averaged retarded Green's functions:

$$G^R(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = G^{A*}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \frac{\pi\nu}{p_F r} \exp[ip_F r - r/2l]$$

and $\langle \dots \rangle_F$ denotes the averaging with the sigma model action $F[Q]$ (Eq.(8)).

For relatively low frequencies $\omega \ll E_c$ the sigma-model correlators for a closed metallic systems can be approximately calculated within the so-called zero-mode approximation [7]. This means that only the spatially constant configurations of the field $Q(\mathbf{r})$ are taken into account, so that the functional integral over $DQ(\mathbf{r})$ is reduced to an integral over a single matrix Q . The latter can be calculated with the use of the technique developed in Refs. [7,10,12]. In particular, the result for the correlator entering rhs of Eq.(10) reads as

$$\langle Q_{bb}^{11} Q_{bb}^{22} \rangle = -1 - \frac{2i\Delta^2}{\pi^2\omega^2} \exp \frac{\pi i\omega}{\Delta} \sin \frac{\pi\omega}{\Delta} \quad (11)$$

with $\Delta = (\nu V)^{-1}$ being the mean level spacing.

We will show below that the leading contribution to the polarizability is given by the second term in Eq.(7) due to the short-range nature of the first one, Eq.(10). For this reason, we do not try to calculate the first term with a better precision and turn to the second one. It can be rewritten as

$$-\langle g_{bb}^{12}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_1) g_{bb}^{21}(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_2) \rangle_F = -(\pi\nu)^2 \langle Q_{bb}^{12}(\mathbf{r}_1) Q_{bb}^{21}(\mathbf{r}_2) \rangle_F \quad (12)$$

In the zero-mode approximation we obtain

$$\langle Q_{bb}^{12}(\mathbf{r}_1) Q_{bb}^{21}(\mathbf{r}_2) \rangle_F \approx -\frac{2i\Delta}{\pi\omega}$$

and eventually,

$$\alpha(\omega) = \frac{e^2}{6} \Delta \nu^2 \int d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 (\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2)^2$$

i.e. the result is frequency independent and real. Thus, in order to obtain the imaginary part of $\alpha(\omega)$ (which determines the conductivity) and to study the frequency dependence of the real part we have to go beyond the zero-mode approximation in treatment of the correlator $\langle Q_{bb}^{12}(\mathbf{r}_1) Q_{bb}^{21}(\mathbf{r}_2) \rangle_F$. For this purpose, we use the method developed in Refs. [13,14]. The idea of this method is to decompose the matrix $Q(\mathbf{r})$ into the constant part Q_0 (zero mode) and the spatially dependent contribution (non-zero modes); then the latter should be integrated out. This step is performed perturbatively, with the parameter being $g^{-1} = \Delta/E_c \ll 1$. The next step is to calculate non-perturbatively the integral over the matrix Q_0 .

Prior to the calculation it is convenient to rewrite $\langle Q_{bb}^{12} Q_{bb}^{21} \rangle$ in terms of a supertrace:

$$\langle Q_{bb}^{12}(\mathbf{r}_1) Q_{bb}^{21}(\mathbf{r}_2) \rangle = \frac{1}{4} \int DQ \text{Str}[\hat{a}Q(\mathbf{r}_1)\hat{b}Q(\mathbf{r}_2)]e^{-F[Q]} \quad (13)$$

Here we have introduced matrices $\hat{a} = \text{diag}(1, -1, 0, 0)$ and $\hat{b} = \text{diag}(0, 0, 1, -1)$. The matrix Q can be parameterized as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\mathbf{r}) &= T_0^{-1} \Lambda \left(1 + \frac{W(\mathbf{r})}{2} \right) \left(1 - \frac{W(\mathbf{r})}{2} \right)^{-1} T_0 = \\ &= T_0^{-1} \Lambda \left[1 + W + \frac{1}{2}W^2 + \frac{1}{4}W^3 + \frac{1}{8}W^4 + \dots \right] T_0 \end{aligned}$$

where the matrix W is block off-diagonal and does not contain a contribution from the zero-wave-vector mode: $\int W(\mathbf{r})d\mathbf{r} = 0$. Now one has to expand the exponent and the pre-exponential factor in powers of W ; then the integration over the fast modes can be easily performed using the Wick's theorem in the same way as it was suggested in Ref. [13]. Restricting ourselves to the leading correction to the zero-mode approximation (terms quadratic in W), we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Q_{bb}^{12}(\mathbf{r}_1) Q_{bb}^{21}(\mathbf{r}_2) \rangle &= \int dQ_0 \left\{ \text{Str}(\hat{a}Q_0\hat{b}Q_0) - \frac{\Pi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)}{4} [\text{Str}(\hat{a}Q_0)\text{Str}(\hat{b}Q_0) - 4] \right\} \times \\ &\times \exp \left[\frac{\pi i}{2\Delta} (\omega + i\delta) \text{Str}(\Lambda Q_0) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The diffusion propagator Π is the solution to the diffusion equation

$$\frac{\partial \Pi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)}{\partial t} - D \nabla^2 \Pi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = (\pi\nu)^{-1} \delta(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2) \quad (15)$$

with appropriate boundary conditions. In particular, if the system is a cube with a size L , we obtain

$$\Pi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) = \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \frac{1}{\pi\nu V} \frac{1}{Dq^2 - i\omega} \cos(q_x x_1) \cos(q_y y_1) \cos(q_z z_1) \cos(q_x x_2) \cos(q_y y_2) \cos(q_z z_2); \quad (16)$$

$$\mathbf{q} = \frac{\pi}{L} (n_x, n_y, n_z), \quad n_i = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots, \quad \sum n_i^2 > 0$$

Since we assume $\omega \ll E_c$ and the mode $\mathbf{q} = 0$ does not contribute to the sum (16), one can neglect ω in the denominator.

Now the integral over Q_0 can be calculated exactly, yielding:

$$\langle Q_{bb}^{12}(\mathbf{r}_1) Q_{bb}^{21}(\mathbf{r}_2) \rangle = -2 \left\{ \frac{i\Delta}{\pi\omega} + \left[1 + i \left(\frac{\Delta}{\pi\omega} \right)^2 \exp \left(\frac{\pi i\omega}{\Delta} \right) \sin \left(\frac{\pi\omega}{\Delta} \right) \right] \Pi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \right\} \quad (17)$$

In order to get the final expression for the polarizability we should combine Eqs. (5), (6), (10) and (17). First we stress that the contributions of $\langle G^R G^R \rangle$, $\langle G^A G^A \rangle$, and of the term (10) are short-ranged (localized on distances $r = |\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|$ of order of the mean free

path l), while that of Eq. (17) is long-ranged. It is easy to check that the contribution of the short-range terms to the frequency-dependent part of $\alpha(\omega)$ is suppressed for arbitrary frequency by the factor $(l/L)^2 \ll 1$. Thus, the contribution of the $\langle Q_{bb}^{12} Q_{bb}^{21} \rangle$ term, Eq. (17), dominates, and we obtain

$$\alpha(\omega) = -\frac{ie^2\omega}{6\pi}(\pi\nu)^2 \left\{ \frac{i\Delta}{\pi\omega} \int (\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2)^2 d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 + \right. \\ \left. + \left[1 + i \left(\frac{\Delta}{\pi\omega} \right)^2 \exp \left(\frac{\pi i\omega}{\Delta} \right) \sin \frac{\pi\omega}{\Delta} \right] \int (\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2)^2 \Pi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 \right\} \quad (18)$$

This expression is valid for any closed or nearly closed [15] diffusive system irrespective to the geometry. For the specified cubic geometry we have

$$\text{Re } \alpha(\omega) = \frac{e^2\nu L^5}{6} - \frac{e^2\beta\omega}{\pi^6 D} L^7 \nu \left(\frac{\Delta}{\pi\omega} \right)^2 \sin \frac{2\pi\omega}{\Delta} \quad (19) \\ \text{Im } \alpha(\omega) = \frac{2e^2\beta\omega}{\pi^6 D} L^7 \nu \left[1 - \left(\frac{\Delta}{\pi\omega} \right)^2 \sin^2 \frac{\pi\omega}{\Delta} \right]$$

with

$$\beta = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2k+1)^6} = \frac{\pi^6}{960}$$

The result (19) is in agreement with the GE one (up to the numerical coefficient, caused by the difference in geometries). Moreover, the general expression (18) is equivalent to the corresponding GE expression. This becomes clear when we realize that the time-integrated conditional probability introduced by GE ($\int dt W_{\mathbf{r}}(\mathbf{r}', t)$ in their notations) is essentially the same as our diffusion propagator $\Pi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$. This equivalence confirms the validity of the assumptions (i), (ii) and (iii), introduced phenomenologically by GE. It is instructive to reformulate these assumptions in terms of the exact single-particle states $\psi_k(\mathbf{r}) \equiv |k\rangle$. Then the assumption (i) means that the amplitudes of these states and the corresponding eigenvalues may be averaged separately, while the assumption (ii) implies the following relation:

$$\langle \psi_k^*(\mathbf{r}) \psi_l(\mathbf{r}) \psi_k(\mathbf{r}') \psi_l^*(\mathbf{r}') \rangle = V^{-2} \Pi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'), \quad k \neq l \quad (20)$$

As is seen from Eq.(20), the diffusion leads to the long-range correlations of the eigenfunctions. This effect can not be obtained in the zero-mode approximation (Gaussian ensemble).

To what extent are the assumptions (i) and (ii) exact? In order to answer this question, we have to note that in the same manner as it was done above for the polarizability we are able to evaluate any quantity given by

$$\lambda(\omega) = T \sum_{\epsilon_m} \int \hat{f}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 \langle G(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \epsilon_m + \omega_n) G(\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_1, \epsilon_m) \rangle \quad (21)$$

with $\hat{f}$ being *arbitrary* operator. Alternatively, one can treat Eq. (21) by GE method. As we have seen, in a particular case $\hat{f} = (\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2)^2$ the results coincide. It is straightforward to see, however, that for $\hat{f} = 1$ the exact calculation gives zero due to the identity (4), while

the RMT calculation in the GE manner would yield a finite result. The reason is that RMT is able to take into account only the long-ranged part of $\langle G^R G^A \rangle$, while other (short-ranged) correlators are always lost. The polarizability is determined by the long-distance behavior of the integrand, and so the RMT result is correct. However, in cases when the short-distance behavior is important, the GE method fails. Summing up, we can say that the GE-style calculation gives the correct result only in the case when the dominant contribution to the integral (21) comes from the large distance range $r = |\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2| \gg l$, which takes place when $\hat{f}$ grows with r .

The following comment is appropriate here. Following GE, we have calculated the response to the uniform electric field and neglected effects of screening. The true polarizability is however a response to the external field rather than to the local one. Effect of the screening on the polarizability was thoroughly studied in Refs. [3,6]. Besides, it was noted in Ref. [3] that non-uniformity of the local field may be important. We should mention in this context that the “local” polarizability χ , defined as the response to the non-uniform electric field $\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r})$,

$$\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{r}) = \int \chi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}') d\mathbf{r}'$$

is given by the expression (18) without the integration over coordinates. This quantity may be directly used for the calculation of the true polarizability.

To conclude, we have provided a *rigorous microscopic calculation* of the linear response expression for the frequency-dependent polarizability of a disordered metallic particle. Our result is in agreement with that of Gor’kov and Eliashberg [1], thus justifying the underlying assumptions of their derivation. This encourages application of RMT *à la* Gor’kov–Eliashberg to more complicated situations. As a very important example, we mention the first steps in non-perturbative treatment of interacting systems [16,17]. Since the higher-order level correlation functions are involved in that case, an attempt to employ the supersymmetry method meets enormous complications. Therefore, RMT (in spirit of GE calculations) is the only available approach to handle these problems. We should stress however on the basis of the above analysis that the assumptions analogous to (i), (ii), (iii) by GE are not always valid, and in any particular case require a careful investigation.

The work was supported by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation (Y. M. B.) and SFB195 der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft (A. D. M.).

REFERENCES

- [1] L. P. Gor'kov and G. M. Eliashberg, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **48**, 1407 (1965) [Sov. Phys. JETP **21**, 940 (1965)].
- [2] M. L. Mehta, *Random Matrices* (Academic Press, N. Y., 1991); O. Bohigas, in: *Chaos and Quantum Physics, Les Houches Session LII, 1989*, Ed. by M.-J. Giannoni, A. Voros, and J. Zinn-Justin (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1991), p.87.
- [3] S. Strässler, M. J. Rice, and P. Wyder, Phys. Rev. **6**, 2575 (1972).
- [4] R. P. Devaty and A. J. Sievers, Phys. Rev. B **22**, 2123 (1980).
- [5] B. I. Shklovskii, Pis'ma Zh. Teor. Fiz. **36**, 287 (1982) [JETP Lett. **36**, 352 (1982)].
- [6] U. Sivan and Y. Imry, Phys. Rev. B **35**, 6074 (1987).
- [7] K. B. Efetov, Adv. Phys. **32**, 53 (1983).
- [8] K. Frahm, B. Mühlischlegel, and R. Németh, Z. Phys. B **78**, 91 (1990); B. Mühlischlegel, in: *Chaos and Quantum Physics, Les Houches Session LII, 1989*, Ed. by M.-J. Giannoni, A. Voros, and J. Zinn-Justin (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1991) p.727.
- [9] B. L. Altshuler and A. G. Aronov, in: *Electron-electron Interactions in Disordered Systems*, Ed. by A. L. Efros and M. Pollak (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1985), p.1.
- [10] J. J. M. Verbaarschot, H. A. Weidenmüller, and M. R. Zirnbauer, Phys. Repts. **129**, 367 (1985).
- [11] V. N. Prigodin, B. L. Altshuler, K. B. Efetov, and S. Iida, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 546 (1994).
- [12] M. R. Zirnbauer, Nucl. Phys. **B265**, 375 (1986).
- [13] V. E. Kravtsov and A. D. Mirlin, Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **60**, 645 (1994) [JETP Lett. **60** 656 (1994)].
- [14] Y. V. Fyodorov and A. D. Mirlin, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 13403 (1995).
- [15] M. R. Zirnbauer, Nucl. Phys. **A560**, 95 (1993).
- [16] Ya. M. Blanter, Preprint cond-mat/9604101.
- [17] F. Zhou, B. Spivak, N. Taniguchi, and B. L. Altshuler, Preprint cond-mat/9508057.